

## REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Office Action mailed March 11, 2004. Claims 1-36 and new Claim 46 are pending in the application. Claims 37-45 have been canceled as indicated above. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the patent application in view of the remarks made herein.

### Restriction Requirement

Applicants affirm the election of Claims 1-36, and have canceled Claims 37-45.

### Claim Amendment

Claim 1 has been amended to explain the operational environment of the docking station. The amendment merely clarifies the prior use of the term "interfacing" in original Claim 1. Applicants do not rely on the amendments in this response to overcome a prior art reference, nor are the amendments required for patentability of the claims. The amendments are made only to clarify the environment of the invention.

Claims 5-8, 13-15, 28 and 31 are amended solely for consistency in relation to the use of the word "releasable" before "connecting module" in Claim 1, and not to distinguish over the prior art.

The dependency of Claim 15 has been amended so that it depends on Claim 1, rather than Claim 14.

New Claim 46 has been added in which the term "removably connected", as used in the Claim 1, is now "removably engaged", which is supported by the language in the disclosure on page 15, line 13.

LAW OFFICES OF  
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>PLLC</sup>  
1420 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 2800  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
206.682.8100

Claims 1-3, 5-10, 23-24 and 36 Were Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as Being Unpatentable Over Torrey et al.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In the Office Action, the Examiner appears to recognize that Torrey et al. lacks the "releasable connecting module removably connected to the main controller box" of Claim 1 and the "connecting module removably connected to the main controller box" of Claim 36. The Examiner refers to an "automatic locking mechanism" in reference to Claim 1, but since there is no automatic locking mechanism in Claim 1 or Claim 36, the applicants assume that the Examiner in fact intended to refer to the releasable connecting module. The releasable connecting module is the only feature not mentioned by the Examiner and since the rejection is based on obviousness, the releasable connecting module must be the feature the Examiner considers to be missing from Claims 1 and 36.

The Examiner, however, goes on to state that the difference between Torrey et al. and Claim 1 is "notoriously well known in the art" and takes "Official Notice" of such. Applicants are unable to ascertain to what the Examiner is referring, and pursuant to M.P.E.P. 2144.03(C) request that the Examiner identify with documentary evidence what he is relying upon. Applicants' attorney has attempted to reach the Examiner by telephone to request clarification and citation of a reference on this point but thus far has not succeeded.

In terms of obviousness over the Torrey et al. reference alone, there is nothing in Torrey et al. to suggest a "connecting module removably connected to the main controller box" as claimed in Claims 1 and 36. The premises station 110 of Torrey et al. is permanently removed from the premises converter 120, and the premises station 210 of Torrey et al. is permanently connected to the premises converter 220. See Figures 1A and 2A, respectively, and the

LAW OFFICES OF  
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>PLLC</sup>  
1420 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 2800  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
206.682.8100

corresponding disclosure in Torrey et al. New Claim 46 also emphasizes this distinction by using the term "removably engaged."

In view of the foregoing, applicants submit that Claims 1 and 36 are in patentable condition. New Claim 46 is also patentable. The remaining claims depend on Claim 1 and therefore are also patentable.

Claims 4, 11-13 and 17-22 Were Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as Being Unpatentable Over Torrey et al. in View of Levanto.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The disclosure of Torrey et al. is deficient for the reasons given above in relation to Claims 1 and 36, and this is sufficient to overcome the rejection of Claims 4, 11-13, and 17-22.

In addition, in relation to Claims 4 and 11-13, the Examiner improperly cites Levanto as showing that locating the translation means in the releasable connecting module is notoriously well known.

Levanto is not relevant to the claimed invention and does not support the Examiner's proposition. Levanto's adaptor 8 connects between a cellular phone 9 and wire network 10. A switch allows either a telephone set or the adaptor 8 to be connected to the wire network 10. In contrast, applicant's docking station provides "wired means for connecting the docking station to a wireline telephone." Levanto does not show wired means for connecting the docking station to a wireline telephone, since the switch intervenes between the telephone and the adaptor 8.

In any event, Levanto fails to show a connecting module removably connected to a main controller box. If the adaptor 8 is the main controller box, then there is no connecting module in Levanto. If the adaptor 8 is the connecting module, then there is no controller box in Levanto. Either way, Levanto completely fails to show or suggest a connecting module removably connected to or engaged with a main controller box.

LAW OFFICES OF  
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>PLLC</sup>  
1420 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 2800  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
206.682.8100

### CONCLUSION

Applicants have carefully reviewed the prior art, and in view of the foregoing remarks, believe the claimed invention to be patentable. Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 14-15 and 25-35. All claims being in allowable condition, applicants respectfully request the early issuance of a notice of allowance. Should any questions remain, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR  
JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>PLLC</sup>



Kevan L. Morgan  
Registration No. 42,015  
Direct Dial No. 206.695.1712

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service in a sealed envelope as first class mail with postage thereon fully prepaid and addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the below date.

Date:

June 14, 2004

Sheila B. King

KLM:jeh/sbk

LAW OFFICES OF  
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>PLLC</sup>  
1420 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 2800  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
206.682.8100